

REMARKS

In the May 18, 2006 Office Action, claims 1-4, 9-14, 34 and 35 stand rejected in view of prior art. Also, claims 1-4, 9-20, 25-32, 34 and 35 also were rejected as being indefinite for failing to indicate and claim particularly and distinctly the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. On the other hand, claims 11 and 14 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Claims 5-8, 21-24, 33 and 36 were withdrawn from consideration.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the May 18, 2006 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 11, 13-15, 21, 25, 29 and 31-35, and cancelled claims 5-8 and 36, as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-4 and 9-35 are pending, with claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Election/Restriction

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, Applicants' election of *Species I* illustrated in Figures 1-14 *without traverse* in the Response filed February 28, 2006 was acknowledged, and claims 5-8, 21-24, 33 and 36 were withdrawn from consideration in this case as being directed to non-elected species. Non-elected claims 5-8 and 36 have been cancelled by the current Amendment as mentioned above. However, Applicants respectfully request that non-elected claims 21-24 and 33 be rejoined in this application and considered upon the allowance of a generic and/or linking claim in accordance with U.S. patent practice. In particular, Applicants believe these claims now depend from allowable generic claims, as explained below.

Specification

Applicants have amended the specification by the current Amendment in order to more closely correspond to the language of the claims as now amended.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

In numbered paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 9-20, 25-32, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that the limitations of "the first cable support surface" and "the second cable pressing surface" make it unclear whether or not there is a second cable support surface and/or a first cable pressing surface. In response, Applicants have amended the claims as indicated above to remove the terms "first" and "second" to avoid any confusion. Applicants believe the limitations of the claims are now clear, and comply with 35 U.S.C. §112. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraphs 4 and 5 (pages 2-4) of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 9-14, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,059,871 (Swager). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to more clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record. Applicants note that including claims 11 and 14 in this section of the Office Action appears to be an inadvertent error. Claims 11 and 14 are indicated as containing allowable subject matter later in the Office Action, and no specific reference to claims 11 and 14 is made in the details of this section of the Office Action. Accordingly, claims 11 and 14 have been rewritten in independent form to accept the apparent allowable subject matter.

In any case, independent claim 1 now requires a support structure having a cable support surface and at least one wire receiving hole, and a cable fixing structure having a cable pressing surface and a wire receiving bore with said wire receiving bore of said cable fixing structure being aligned with said wire receiving hole of said support structure when said cable fixing structure is in said cable release position to receive the inner wire therein, and said wire receiving bore of said cable fixing structure being offset from said wire receiving hole of said support structure when said cable fixing structure is in said cable fixing position in order to secure the inner wire. Clearly, this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Swager patent or any other prior art of record.

Specifically, in the Swager patent, the wire extends through a single hole, and merely squeezed within the single hole when a member 20 is moved a certain way. Thus, the

Swager patent does *not* disclose or suggest *a wire receiving bore of a cable fixing structure aligned with a wire receiving hole of a support structure in a cable release position and offset from the wire receiving hole of the support structure in a cable fixing position*, as now claimed. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection of independent claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 2-4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 34 and 35 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 34 and 35 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 1, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 34 and 35 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 11 and 14 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, Applicants have amended claims 11 and 14 to place them in independent form, as mentioned above. Thus, independent claims 11 and 14 are believed to be allowable.

Applicants also believe that claims 15-20 and 25-32 are now in condition for allowance, in view of the amendments and comments above with respect to the indefiniteness rejection of these claims. In other words, claims 15-20 and 25-32 were not rejected in view of prior art. Accordingly, since claims 15-20 and 25-32 are now believed to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, claims 15-20 and 25-32 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that non-elected claims 21-24 and 33 be rejoined in this application and also allowed since these claims depend from claims 15-20 and 25-32, which are now believed to be allowable.

Appl. No. 10/725,370
Amendment dated August 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2006

* * *

In view of the foregoing Amendments and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-4, 9-20, 25-32, 34 and 35 are now allowable. Also, Applicants respectfully request that the pending non-elected claims 21-24 and 33 be rejoined in this application and also allowed since they depend from claims that are believed to be allowable and generic and/or linking claims in accordance with U.S. patent practice. In any event, reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and comments. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick A. Hilsmier
Reg. No. 46,034

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: August 17, 2006

G:\08-AUG06-YTY\SN-US035136 Amendment.doc